



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/073,241	02/13/2002	Marko Karppanen	1154.41135X00	8874

20457 7590 03/20/2006

ANTONELLI, TERRY, STOUT & KRAUS, LLP
1300 NORTH SEVENTEENTH STREET
SUITE 1800
ARLINGTON, VA 22209-3873

EXAMINER

MCCARTHY, CHRISTOPHER S

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2113

DATE MAILED: 03/20/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/073,241	Applicant(s) KARPPANEN, MARKO	
	Examiner Christopher S. McCarthy	Art Unit 2113	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 February 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 9-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 9-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 13 February 2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other: <u>response to arguments</u> |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 9-16, 19-23, 25, and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Golikeri et al. U.S. Patent Application Publication US2003/0067926, as cited in prior office action, which was mailed on 11/2/05.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 9-16, 19-23, 25, and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Golikeri et al. U.S. Patent Application Publication US2003/0067926.

As per claim 9, Goliekeri teaches a method for improving the reliability of a computer system including a bus, and plug-in units coupled thereto (paragraph (P) 0036), comprising: providing to each of plural plug-in unit a s separate interface circuit such that each of said plug-in unit is connected to said bus via said interface circuit corresponding thereto (P 0036); addressing a respective plug-in unit, via the bus, by addressing operations directed at said respective plug-in unit and which are monitored by interface circuit corresponding thereto (P

Art Unit: 2113

0039); performing a time duration operation of addressing of said plug-in unit (P 0039); and checking the state of addressing of the addressed plug-in unit such that (i) when the addressing is ended before expiration of a predetermined period of time, the time duration operation of addressing is terminated and a new time duration operation of addressing is set to commence at time of next occurrence of addressing (P 0041), and (ii) when the duration operation of addressing exceeds the predetermined time period, the addressing to that plug-in unit is terminated by said interface circuit corresponding thereto by sending into the bus a signal indicating termination of addressing (P 0039).

As per claim 10, Goliekeri teaches a method as defined in claim 9, wherein: the time duration of addressing is monitored using a watchdog timer with a predetermined timing set therein (P 0041).

As per claim 11, Goliekeri teaches a method as defined in claim 9, wherein: when addressing is terminated an error signal is set by the interface circuit into an active state in the bus (P 0039; wherein, when the address is purged, upon an error, a purge message is sent on the bus).

As per claim 12, Goliekeri teaches a method as defined in claim 9, wherein: when addressing is terminated an error signal indicating an error condition in the plug-in unit is set by the interface circuit into active state in the status register of the plug-in unit (P 0040, 0041; wherein, the status of the register is inherently changed in that the module will no longer send out “keep-live” messages to other modules, so they will know that the address was purged, Just in case the purge message was not received by all other modules).

Art Unit: 2113

As per claim 13, Golikeri teaches an interface circuit for providing local monitoring capability to a plug-in unit of a computer system including a bus; and plug-in units coupled to said bus; wherein a separate interface circuit is provided to connect each of said plug-in unit to said bus (P 0036) and comprising: a watchdog timer (P 0039, 0041); first means for activating the watchdog timer upon start of an addressing operation directed to the plug-in unit corresponding thereto, and second means for sending into the bus a signal indication termination of addressing, the termination of addressing being effected when the duration of said addressing exceeds a predetermined time duration for addressing, as measured by the watchdog timer (P 0039).

As per claim 14, Golikeri teaches an interface circuit as defined in claim 13, further comprising: means for setting an error signal into active state in the bus (P 0039).

As per claim 15, Golikeri teaches an interface circuit as defined in 13, further comprising: for setting a signal indicating an error condition in the plug-in unit into an active state in the status register of the plug-in unit (P 0040, 0041; wherein, the status of the register is inherently changed in that the module will no longer send out “keep-live” messages to other modules, so they will know that the address was purged, Just in case the purge message was not received by all other modules).

As per claim 16, Golikeri teaches an interface circuit as defined in 14, further comprising: for setting a signal indicating an error condition in the plug-in unit into an active state in the status register of the plug-in unit (P 0040, 0041; wherein, the status of the register is inherently changed in that the module will no longer send out “keep-live” messages to other modules, so

Art Unit: 2113

they will know that the address was purged, Just in case the purge message was not received by all other modules).

As per claim 19, Golikeri teaches an interface circuit as defined in claim 13, wherein each said interface circuit is provided as a part of said plug-in unit corresponding thereto (P 0036-0039; fig. 2).

As per claim 20, Golikeri teaches a method according to claim 10, wherein: said watchdog timer is provided at each said interface circuit or at each said plug-in unit (P 0039, 0041).

As per claim 21, Golikeri teaches a computer system including a bus and at least one plug-in unit coupled thereto, wherein the improvement comprises: providing a plurality of interface circuit and a plurality of one plug-in unit each of which is connected to said bus via a separate said interface circuit corresponding thereto (P 0036), wherein each said interface circuit comprises a watchdog timer (P 0039, 0041), first means for activating the watchdog timer upon start of an addressing operation directed to the plug-in unit corresponding thereto, and second means for sending into the bus a signal indicating termination of addressing, the termination of addressing being effected when the duration of said addressing exceeds a predetermined time duration for addressing, as measured by the watchdog timer (P 0039).

As per claim 22, Golikeri teaches a computer system according to claim 21, wherein each said interface further comprises: means for setting an error signal into an active state in the bus (P 0039).

As per claim 23, Golikeri teaches a computer system according to claim 22, wherein each said interface circuit comprises means for setting a signal indicating an error condition in the

Art Unit: 2113

corresponding plug-in unit into an active state in a status register of the plug-in unit (P 0040, 0041; wherein, the status of the register is inherently changed in that the module will no longer send out “keep-live” messages to other modules, so they will know that the address was purged, Just in case the purge message was not received by all other modules (P 0040, 0041; wherein, the status of the register is inherently changed in that the module will no longer send out “keep-live” messages to other modules, so they will know that the address was purged, Just in case the purge message was not received by all other modules).

As per claim 25, Golikeri teaches a computer system according to claim 21, wherein each said interface circuit comprises means for setting a signal indicating an error condition in the plug-in unit into an active state in a status register of the plug-in unit (P 0040, 0041; wherein, the status of the register is inherently changed in that the module will no longer send out “keep-live” messages to other modules, so they will know that the address was purged, Just in case the purge message was not received by all other modules).

As per claim 27, Golikeri teaches a computer system according to claim 21, wherein each said interface circuit is provided as a part of said plug-in unit corresponding thereto (P 0036-0039, Figure 2).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 17-18, 24, 26, 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Golikeri in view of Microsoft Computer Dictionary, referred hereon as Microsoft.

As per claim 17, Golikeri teaches an interface circuit as defined in claim 13 with a bus (P 0036). Golikeri does not explicitly teach wherein the bus is a CompactPCI bus. Microsoft does teach a CompactPCI bus (page 99). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the CompactPCI bus of Microsoft in the bus system of Golikeri. One of ordinary skill would have been motivated to use the CompactPCI bus of Microsoft in the bus system of Golikeri because Microsoft teaches wherein the CompactPCI bus is suitable for high-speed communication devices, such as router; this is an explicit embodiment of Golikeri (0088), and a high speed communication means would have been a desired advantage in Golikeri in that he teaches the desire of multiple connected peripheral modules, such as routers, in strict synchronization with another.

As per claim 18, Golikeri teaches an interface circuit as defined in claim 16 with a bus (P 0036). Golikeri does not explicitly teach wherein the bus is a CompactPCI bus. Microsoft does teach a CompactPCI bus (page 99). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the CompactPCI bus of Microsoft in the bus system of Golikeri. One of ordinary skill would have been motivated to use the CompactPCI bus of Microsoft in the bus system of Golikeri because Microsoft teaches wherein the CompactPCI bus is suitable for high-speed communication devices, such as router; this is an explicit embodiment of Golikeri (0088), and a high speed communication means would have been a desired advantage in Golikeri in that he teaches the desire of multiple connected peripheral modules, such as routers, in strict synchronization with another.

As per claim 24, Golikeri teaches a computer system according to claim 23, with a bus (P 0036). Golikeri does not explicitly teach wherein the bus is a CompactPCI bus. Microsoft does teach a CompactPCI bus (page 99). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the CompactPCI bus of Microsoft in the bus system of Golikeri. One of ordinary skill would have been motivated to use the CompactPCI bus of Microsoft in the bus system of Golikeri because Microsoft teaches wherein the CompactPCI bus is suitable for high-speed communication devices, such as router; this is an explicit embodiment of Golikeri (0088), and a high speed communication means would have been a desired advantage in Golikeri in that he teaches the desire of multiple connected peripheral modules, such as routers, in strict synchronization with another.

As per claim 26, Golikeri teaches a computer system according to claim 21, with a bus (P 0036). Golikeri does not explicitly teach wherein the bus is a CompactPCI bus. Microsoft does teach a CompactPCI bus (page 99). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the CompactPCI bus of Microsoft in the bus system of Golikeri. One of ordinary skill would have been motivated to use the CompactPCI bus of Microsoft in the bus system of Golikeri because Microsoft teaches wherein the CompactPCI bus is suitable for high-speed communication devices, such as router; this is an explicit embodiment of Golikeri (0088), and a high speed communication means would have been a desired advantage in Golikeri in that he teaches the desire of multiple connected peripheral modules, such as routers, in strict synchronization with another.

As per claim 28, Golikeri teaches a computer system according to claim 27, with a bus (P 0036). Golikeri does not explicitly teach wherein the bus is a CompactPCI bus. Microsoft does

Art Unit: 2113

teach a CompactPCI bus (page 99). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the CompactPCI bus of Microsoft in the bus system of Golikeri. One of ordinary skill would have been motivated to use the CompactPCI bus of Microsoft in the bus system of Golikeri because Microsoft teaches wherein the CompactPCI bus is suitable for high-speed communication devices, such as router; this is an explicit embodiment of Golikeri (0088), and a high speed communication means would have been a desired advantage in Golikeri in that he teaches the desire of multiple connected peripheral modules, such as routers, in strict synchronization with another.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed 2/1/06 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

With respect to claim 9, the applicant has argued that Golikeri does not teach an interface circuit provided to the plug-in unit. The examiner respectfully disagrees. The main argument of the applicant seems to be that Golikeri is missing an interface circuit. The examiner contends that an interface circuit is inherent with the module of Golikeri, in that each module inherently contains a separate interface to the bus to which the module, as a whole, is connected to the bus. The examiner further contends that since the interface circuit is contained within the module, then the module can be interpreted as the interface circuit, or vice-versa; that is, any action being taken as directed by the module, is inherently being taken by the incorporated interface circuit. The claim language of the present invention does not distinctly distinguish the interface circuit as

a separate entity from the plug-in module; it only says the plug-in module is “provided” the interface circuit, and this terminology can be interpreted as being provided within the unit. The applicant further argues that Golikeri does not teach wherein the interface unit does not teach the monitoring of the addressing of the plug-in unit. As mentioned above, the module of Golikeri does teach the monitoring of the addressing (paragraph 0036-0037); therefore, since the interface circuit is one and the same as the module, then the limitation, as claimed, is fulfilled.

Furthermore, the applicant argues that the interface circuit/module does not teach a time duration operation addressing of the plug-in units, whereby, the state of addressing of the plug-in units is checked by timing, and when a time duration of addressing is exceeded, the addressing to the specific plug-in is terminated. The examiner respectfully disagrees. This limitation is fulfilled by the module of Golikeri in paragraph 0039, wherein the module performs this function.

Golikeri teaches that an address operation is timed and if no other communication is sent to or from that address of the module, than the timer times out and the address is deemed obsolete.

The term “addressing” is interpreted to be any addressing operation, and is taught by Golikeri in that the module contains an address and if it is not used, it is mad obsolete and if it is used, the timer is reset and it remains functional. Since this operation is maintained at the local module and the timer resets or directed from other modules, then it fulfills the argument that an addressing operation is being performed at the local module.

With respect to claims 13 and 21, the applicant has argued that Golikeri does not teach activating a watchdog timer upon startup of an addressing operation directed to a plug-in unit; furthermore, the applicant has argued that Golikeri does not teach a second means for sending in the bus a signal indicating termination of the addressing process when the duration of the

Art Unit: 2113

addressing exceeds a predetermined time duration as measured by the watchdog timer. The examiner respectfully disagrees on both accounts. First, Golikeri does teach using a timer to time the addressing operation of the module (paragraph 0041) and, second, Golikeri does teach sending a purge message to all other modules when exceeding a time duration (paragraph 0039). The examiner contends that these functions, as performed by the module of Golikeri, fulfill the claimed invention.

In light of the above arguments, all applicable claims stand rejected. The applicant is suggested to clarify the claim language to specify that the interface circuit is a separate and distinct entity from the plug-in unit, if that is the overcoming inventive concept.

Conclusion

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2113

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christopher S. McCarthy whose telephone number is (571)272-3651. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 9 - 5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert Beausoliel can be reached on (571)272-3645. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

csm

March 14, 2006


ROBERT BEAUSOLIEL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100